Over the past year-and-a-bit, the Canadian right-of-centre (including myself) has consistently underestimated Carney's political prowess. When he launched his leadership campaign, it looked safe to assume that his prime ministership was destined to fall into the Campbell/Turner/Tupper bin - that is, a brief interregnum that starts with a leadership election victory and ends in a general election loss. Then, once he pulled off a tight-yet-convincing win against Poilievre, the goalposts shifted and it seemed reasonable to conclude that he would wind up like Paul Martin - wins party leadership, wins minority government, governs for the following year-and-a-half, loses following general election. Now, with Carney having converted his minority into a majority (ableit narrowly) through a spate of floor crossings - which allows him to govern continuously until 2029 - plus a comfortable polling lead against a CPC consumed with internecine knife fights, the LPC PM most analogous to Carney would be Louis St. Laurent (who governed for close to nine years).

As the Black Horse recently remarked, we are living in the Thousand Year Carney Reich - an age of political stagnancy and mediocrity,

characterized by exercises of raw political power. And given the generally degraded state of Canada as of present, this Reich feels much more akin to Brezhnev's tenure as General Secretary of the CPSU than it does to the peace and prosperity of the '50s under St. Laurent.

All of this begs the question - how was the LPC able to pull this off? It is easy - and somewhat necessary - to blame the weakness of their opponents. As I've written previously, Pierre is Pwned; his temperament makes him wholly unlikeable and causes his libertarian inclinations (which don't provide much of a defense against left-liberalism) to seem more extreme than they actually are. The early 2025 replacement of Trudeau with Carney caught him off guard, and he hasn't been to successfully adapt to his current predicament - cognitively, he's stuck in the triumphalism of 2024, when he was universally regarded as an inevitable PM-in-waiting.

It is also easy-and-necessary to blame a disproportionately older segment of the electorate for our eternaliberal government. As David Colleto explained earlier this week with his Security Spectrum, there is a

sizable chunk of the populace - one that is far more likely to exercise the franchise than other chunks - that is “anchored”, i.e. completely secure in their station in life, harbouring no insecurities in any domains, and prone to a smug self-satisfied complacency. They, like the regime apparatchiks who vacationed in dachas during the late-Soviet period, are temperamentally conservative and wholly benefit from the existing order. Any interactions they have with the political system will be done with the intention of preserving the current structures in place. As such, they remain a profound and infuriating obstacle to anyone looking to exact systemic changes.

But despite the ineffectual nature of the opposition and the pliancy of the general public, there is something to be said about the progenitors of this state of affairs - the LPC itself. After all, everything about the Trudeau-to-Carney pivot - from the shunning of Freeland to clear the way for Carney’s leadership landslide, to the engineering of the “Elbows Up” moment, to the attainment of a coveted HoC majority - was done with a remarkable, ruthless efficiency and a thorough understanding of the mechanics of our political system. And in this process, Trudeau’s

peak woke - an ideology with both many true believers and fervent detractors - was shedded in favour of a technocratic YIMBYism, a more wonkish, less emotive belief system that's harder to effectively criticize. The LPC pulled their soldiers out of the proverbial bailey and positioned them in the motte.

So, what does the LPC believe?

A good place to start in this endeavor would be Part I of *The Machiavellians* by James Burnham. In it, the Trotskyist-turned-neocon examines the subtext behind *De Monarchia*, Dante Alighieri's only major work besides *Divine Comedy*. Burnham provides an analysis of the treatise if taken at face value:

> In the first place, we may note that the ultimate goal (eternal salvation in Heaven) by which Dante holds that all political questions must be judged is in the strictest sense impossible, since there is no such place as Heaven. Second, the lesser goals derived from the ultimate goal - the development of the full potentialities of all men, universal peace, and a single unified world-state though they are perhaps not

> inconceivable, are nevertheless altogether Utopian and materially impossible. Third, the many arguments that Dante uses in favour of his position are, from a purely formal point of view, both good and bad, mostly bad ; but, from the point of view of actual political conditions in the actual world of space and time and history, they are almost without exception completely irrelevant. They consist of pointless metaphysical and logical distinctions, distorted analogies, garbled historical references, appeals to miracles and arbitrarily selected authorities. In the task of giving us in .. formation about how men behave, about the nature and laws of political life, about what steps may be taken in practice to achieve concrete political and social goals, they advance us not a single step.

This is what Burnham calls the formal meaning - a potemkin construction meant to conceal, but ultimately express, the real meaning. To find the real meaning of *De Monarchia*, Burnham examines the political context in which Dante was situated, which I'll provide a short summation of.

In the thirteenth century, Florence - the city in which Dante was born and raised - was consumed by a conflict between two rival factions, the Guelphs and the Ghibellines. The Guelphs were loyal to the Papacy, and the Ghibellines to the Holy Roman Empire. Dante, born a Guelph, was heavily involved in this conflict, and fought at the Battle of Campaldino, which secured Guelph dominance of Florence. This, however, proved not to be the end of such factional disputes, as by 1300 the Guelphs had fractured into two camps - the hardliners (known as Neri) and the centrists, like Dante, who had tried to compromise with the Ghibellines (known as Bianchi). With these new battle lines drawn, the Bianchi formed an alliance with the Ghibellines of Tuscany, and became de-facto Ghibellines themselves. Nevertheless, such support was not enough to overcome the Neri, and Dante and his ilk were forced into exile. As Burnham puts it:

> Dante never re-entered Florence. The rest of his days were spent wandering among the households of the remaining Ghibelline princes in northern Italy. His revenge on his Guelph enemies had to be satisfied by thrusting them into the worst torments of his Inferno.

It is within this context that the real meaning is situated:

> Eternal salvation, the highest development of man's potentialities, everlasting peace, unity, and harmony, the delicate balance of abstract relations between Church and State, all these ghosts and myths evaporate, along with the whole elaborate structure of theology, metaphysics, allegory, miracle, and fable. The entire formal meaning, which has told us nothing and proved nothing, assumes its genuine role of merely expressing and disguising the real meaning. This real meaning is simply an impassioned propagandistic defence of the point of view of the turncoat Bianchi exiles from Florence, specifically ; and more generally of the broader Ghibelline point of view to which these Bianchi capitulated. De Monarchia is, we might say, a Ghibelline Party Platform.

The formal meaning, as we see, is window dressing, florid language espousing utopian abstractions. Once it is eviscerated, we are left with something much less impressive - in the case of *De Monarchia*, a tract that Burnham describes as “traitorous” and “reactionary”. This method

of concealment, though, despite being deployed in a 700 year old treatise, is hardly an antiquated form of political communication; Burnham notices such techniques being deployed by his contemporaries, namely the Democratic Party in their 1932 platform. It could easily, as you may have guessed, be applied to the LPC and their belief system.

Now, the precise term most suited to describing the LPC's belief system would be, to borrow from Mosca, a *political formula* - an ideology that is considered acceptable, even noble or unimpeachable, by the mores of the society and polity it finds itself in, yet functions as something of a concealment mechanism. As Sam Francis says in *Leviathan and Its Enemies*:

> Elites, in other words, do not usually claim, publicly or privately, that they are acting in a particular way because such action is in their group interest. They claim rather that their action is in accordance with the will of God, the principles of morality, the laws of nature, the national interest, the destiny of a race, the inevitable course of history, the will or good of the people or of mankind, or is a step toward some

widely approved value such as peace, liberty, justice, prosperity, or stability.

With this established, it is worth turning our attention towards one of the most famous political formulas currently marshalled by a government: Socialism with Chinese characteristics (SwCC), the moniker used by the CCP to describe both its "ideology" and its policy programme. This is not to say that the LPC is completely analogous to the CCP in terms of its grip on power or suppression of the citizenry; such a claim would be absurd. Rather, SwCC serves as a useful foil to the LPC's political formula.

SwCC, as it is usually understood, refers to China's shift under Deng Xiaoping towards what might be described as "state capitalism", and away from the rigid Marxist economics that so impoverished China under Mao. Such a political formula allowed China to grow vastly in economic might; however, the levers of political power in the country were still kept under the grip of the CCP, with any support for democratization or political freedoms being summarily quashed. China

is ostensibly socialist, yet the term "socialist" is somewhat of a vestigial formal meaning, with SwCC concealing what the country actually is (i.e. a nationalist security state).

On a similar note, I would contend that the political formula of the LPC is, and has been since Pearson's time as PM, *Managerial Humanism with Laurentian characteristics* (MHwLC for short).

To start, I'll break down the former half of this formula: *Managerial Humanism*.

Managerial Humanism, as a concept, originates from the aforementioned *Leviathan and Its Enemies*, and Sam Francis explains it in the following terms:

> As a doctrine, a formal system of ideas, managerial humanism may be defined as the belief that all men can (or should or will) be governed in their social, economic, and political relationships by the science of management, the science of operating and directing mass organizations.

Francis goes on to lay out the four "elemental ideologies" of Managerial Humanism -scientism, utopianism, hedonism, cosmopolitanism - and how these four elements bind together:

> Managerial humanism incorporates scientism because the premise on which management is based is that human beings and their social relationships are analogous to the phenomena of inert nature and can be manipulated by scientific techniques in the same way. It is utopian or melioristic because it claims that a significant or complete amelioration of the human condition is possible by means of the application of the science of management (as well as other sciences) to human affairs. It is hedonistic because it rejects the work ethic and ideals of the socialized individualism of the bourgeois order, and its view of amelioration and of the utopia that can or will come into being is based on the gratification of material appetites and the avoidance of deferral and sacrifice. The scientism of managerial humanism denies or tends not to recognize nonmaterial motivations and needs of human beings or interprets such needs as ultimately materialistic in nature. Managerial humanism, finally, is cosmopolitan because it

> encompasses an abstract view of man that tends to ignore or reject the particularities of his historical and social existence (especially the differentiated groups, classes, and local communities of the bourgeois order) and emphasizes what is common to all men at all times and in all places and circumstances. The global or transnational organization of mankind under the discipline and ideologies of managerialism and human liberation from or transcendence of national, parochial, social and economic, racial, and sectarian categories are the highest goals of managerial humanism, and it is because of the cosmopolitan and universalist premises of the ideology that its description as "humanism" is appropriate.

MH - which could also be described under synonyms such as left-liberalism or progressivism - is the default ideology of our age among the oikophobic and deracinated ruling classes of almost all western countries. It is the water is which us fish swim, with its axioms and presuppositions seeming so self-evident to many that they scarcely need to be seriously examined or questioned. Of course, MH comes in

different packages and exists on a gradient - some versions, such as those employed by Carney and the Chretien-Martin regime, rely more heavily on supply-side economics and eschew activist government, and what one might bluntly call gay race communism. Other, more virulent strains - those of Pearson, PET, and JT - lean deeper into leftism. Overall, however, there is a baseline set of policy programmes that flow from MH and which all LPC politicians in good standing for the past 60 years have be expected to support - single-payer medicine, multiculturalism, a generous welfare state, gun control, a permissive immigration system, varying degrees of environmental protection, peacekeeping, etc.

All of this, while explanatory to some degree, inevitably begs the question: what about this is distinct to Canada? Here is perhaps the greatest distinction between MHwLC and the aforementioned SwCC - with SwCC, the ideological abstractions (socialism, or technically Marxism-Leninism) are vestigial and anachronistic while the regional adaptations (Chinese characteristics) are more pronounced. MHwLC - since the LPC is xenophilic in nature - is the opposite. The Laurentian

Elite - the class which uses the LPC as its political vehicle - is, as Voltaire said of the Holy Roman Empire, neither.

Yet Laurentian characteristics, as unimportant as they generally are, still exist. Bilingualism, for instance, is borne of the "French Fact" and universally beloved among the LPC top brass - a noteworthy distinction from other Anglo countries, where an emphasis on "official languages" is considered right-coded. King Charles is still technically our head of state - although, as everyone knows, he is basically a taxpayer-funded hood ornament who provides a bit of pomp and circumstance. The House of Windsor's viceroy hasn't intervened directly in politics since the King-Byng affairs exactly a century ago.

Other Laurentian characteristics are slight adaptations of general MH beliefs.

Westminster Parliamentary Democracy - a term that gets bandied about a great deal by LPC apparatchiks - is often used to distinguish the supposedly calm and orderly Canadian political system from the chaos of the Republican model down south. This generally tracks with the MH

emphasis on “democracy” as an abstract good and signifier of legitimacy - yet the *Westminster Parliamentary* portion denotes the blending of the executive and legislative branches plus the separation of head of state and head of government into different positions.

Much like MH adherents in other countries, the LPC need a client group that can be deemed the Most Oppressed Minority, with that client group then being given certain privileges and entitlements as a way to compensate for past injustices, both real and perceived. In the United States, African-Americans have long filled this role, with their enslavement held up as the ultimate crime for which eternal atonement is demanded. In Canada, First Nations are thrust into such a position, with residential schools - and the dubious claims about made about their supposedly genocidal nature, which some want to make illegal to question - being made out to be the Ultimate Crime, a crime that is often weaponized in service of demolishing the sovereignty and territorial integrity of the state.

Multiculturalism, for its part, is regionally adapted through emphasis on the "mosaic not a melting pot" bromide - a phrase that explicitly acknowledges our lack of emphasis on assimilating immigrants, holds this up as some sort of moral virtue, and contrasts this with the supposed horrors of the American "melting pot", portrayed as a draconian ultra-assimilationist regiment.

Up to this point, what I have described may seem, as most formal meanings are, rather inane - boilerplate left-liberalism hitched to King Chuckles, the French language, the oppression of the First Nations people, and some blather about "mosaics". It is similar in many ways to Dante's florid ramblings about universal peace and a unified world-state.

What then, you may ask, is the *real* meaning? To answer this question, we should turn to the moniker with which the LPC is frequently ascribed: the natural governing party. At first glance this phrase seems to be purely empirical in nature - that is, it describes the fact that of the 15 LPC leaders since Confederation, 11 have been PM for some duration of time. But "natural governing party" also contains a normative claim, one

that forms the real meaning behind MHwLC: the LPC has the *right to govern*. They are what Curtis Yarvin calls a "hard party":

> A hard party is a party designed to take unconditional control of the state. A hard party is a party in which all members delegate 100% of their political energy to the party's command. Joining a hard party is a political marriage, not an election-night hookup with any random politician whose name on a lawn sign catches your eye.
>
> A hard party is a legal private organization whose goal is to become the ruling party of the next government. Like the CCP in China. Its voters will elect this government. Its officers will staff it. Its donors will host its state dinners. Its ideas will become the official ideology—the official truth. They had better actually be true!

The LPC exists to form government. It views itself as the political embodiment of Canada - the LPC is Canada and Canada is the LPC. Where goes the LPC, so goes Canada. MHwLC contains not just ideas believed by some Canadians - it is, as Chrystia Freeland once said of her

political beliefs, “simply Canadian”. Going against it is UnCanadian, and means you are either emotionally incontinent or cognitively challenged. Oh, and something of a quisling to boot.

All of the various epistemological and normative claims made in the MHwLC formula have not been selected because they contain unique insights into the nature of reality; rather, they are *dominant ideas* - ideas that validate the use of power and serve the pre-existing self-interests of the LPC. All the constituent parts of the formula can be broken down according to this logic.

Let’s start with the four “elemental ideologies” of MH. Scientism posits that humans are blank slates whose fundamental nature can be altered via social engineering - a position that naturally gives greater prestige, importance, and control to the bureaucrats (hired by LPC governments) who will invariably do this social engineering. Utopianism, promising paradise on earth, involves a transfer of power to the LPC-aligned academics who will make this utopia a reality. Hedonism weakens the traditional bourgeois social fabric that makes it possible for people to

form strong communities independent of the managerial state; this means, in the absence of a strong sense of social trust and cohesion, people become more reliant on the managerial state (which, of course, the LPC favours the expansion of) for support. And cosmopolitanism - which purports to transcend localist and tribal identities (although, in practice, the proponents of cosmopolitanism encourage tribal identity in certain groups while denying it to others) - makes it harder for opponents of the LPC to effectively challenge it by stripping away the identities under which they might organize.

What binds all of these elements together - in the context of them being dominant ideas - is that fact that they either create pretexts for giving more power to the LPC or they degrade and impoverish those would potentially seek to remove the LPC from power.

(It is worth noting that policy positions could flow from the MH elements that *don't* validate the LPC's power; these positions, though, would obviously not be adopted by the LPC as they would be *regressive* ideas - the antonym of dominant ideas. Those who believe in the

regressive versions of these beliefs tend to gravitate to the NDP, the bastion where true believers are contained).

The LC - as I previously noted - are the ancillary half of the formula. The performative embrace of the British Monarchy put on by the LPC lends them a fig leaf of traditionalism, which they can use to conceal the fact that their ideological project for the past 60 years has slowly demolished the conception of Canada that the monarchy represents. Since the monarch is functionally powerless, there is no serious risk of their power being invalidated. Mosaic-not-a-melting-pot and *Westminster Parliamentary Democracy* function as ways to differentiate Canada, however pedantically, from the U.S. - ways they can satiate the anti-American thirsts of their base and increase their chances of electoral victory.

Perhaps the most blatant example of a LC that is purely a dominant idea is official bilingualism. It is also the LC that clashes the most brazenly with MH - particularly with multiculturalism - and creates some interesting contradictions.

One of the central tenants of MH in its modern form is an emphasis on "diversity", on the elevation of non cis-hetero-white-male candidates into job positions in order to reflect the demographic composition of the country, with that composition in turn having been significantly altered through waves of replacement migration. A defining feature of these candidates, particularly those of the non-white variety, is the fact that their native tongue is often Punjabi, Mandarin, Tagalog, etc. Requiring fluency in both French and English, therefore, forces these candidates to learn two non-native languages, significantly decreasing their chances of meeting such qualifications. As I previously mentioned, stipulating that a polity has an "official language" is usually a policy supported by the right - and naturally opposed by the champions of "diversity". Yet Justin Trudeau - the most enthusiastic proponent of DEI dogma to be PM - expanded bilingualism requirements to the Supreme Court, along with a raft of other bureaucratic positions. So what gives?

To understand this paradox, something else must be understood: the LPC, despite being a hard party, is not a monolith. Rather, it can be

divided, as in 1984, into an Inner Party and Outer Party - the Inner Party being the real hard party, the Outer Party much less so.

The Inner Party - the sanctum in which actual power rests and privileges flow from - is, and has been since the LPC's inception, a small clique of francophone upper-middle class professionals from Montreal and Ottawa, plus a few members of Toronto's upper crust. Some degree of meritocracy is present - Alberta-borns such as Chrystia Freeland, Jim Coutts, and Mark Carney made their way into the hard party by virtue of obtaining elite educations. Yet implicit in the structures of the hard party is an understanding that those within it will hail from a particular Laurentian milieu. You can see this in the way that, until Ignatieff's ignominious stint as leader, every LPC head was a cabinet minister in the government of the previous LPC PM - or the party's insistence on rotating between francophone and anglophone leaders. The fact that the LPC - which has foisted multiculturalism and diversitarianism on Canada for five decades - has never had a non-white, non-male leader (not even a white ethnic leader) serves to underscore this point.

In the Canada of 2026, however, holding the support of this rather narrow and particular milieu is insufficient in terms of winning a general election - the abject purpose of the LPC, after all. This is where client groups, who constitute the Outer Party, come in - segments of the electorate that the LPC engages in brokerage with, promising specific goods and entitlements in exchange for support at the ballot box.

The veritable stew of ethnic diasporas brought in through decades of mass immigration form a constellation of client groups ripe for exploitation - many privileges, such as lesser criminal sentences, preferential hiring practices, and the promise to make importing their extended family easier, are offered to them by the LPC as rewards for voting the right way.

And while the LPC no doubt takes great pains to ensure that they stay on good terms with these groups, mechanisms - like official bilingualism - remain in place to gatekeep the ranks of the Inner Party from the unwashed masses. It is for this reason that I would contend that the LPC Inner Party is only nominally ani-white - they are anti-white, it goes

without saying, in regards to anyone outside the parameters of their milieu. But - and this is perhaps the reason they have endured this long - they have enough self-preservation instinct, and lack enough oikophobia, to prevent themselves from being completely swamped by the undifferentiated masses they let in, at least until now.

LPC client groups, I should mention, are not static. Old ones are discarded when they no longer serve an immediate electoral purpose, and new ones are courted for political gain.

Up until the Chretien-Martin era, socially conservative Catholics - many of whom were Irish, Italian, and Portuguese immigrants - constituted a client group that reliably backed the LPC. After the Pearson-PET paradigm shift - which included PET's decriminalization of homosexuality and abortion - this group had no real influence on the policy trajectory of the party, yet still clung on as an anachronistic rump faction, somewhat akin to the Dixiecrats in the U.S. In 1996, when the Chretien government made sexual orientation a prohibited grounds of discrimination under the Canadian Human Rights act, 29 MPs in the

177-seat LPC caucus voted against the change; Chretien's embrace of gay marriage at the end of his tenure in 2003 signaled that the LPC - increasingly powered by PMC votes in urban centres - no longer needed Socon Catholics as a client group.

Boomers, meanwhile, have emerged in recent years as a reliable client group, surpassing even the ethnic minorities in most-favoured status. Indeed, the largest swings towards the LPC in the 2025 election were in disproportionately older, wealthier ridings. In many ways, they are the ideal clients for the party to have. Being highly secure in their station in life, they are temperamentally conservative and by-and-large satisfied with the policies and power structures currently in place; TFWs, a well-funded OAS program, and a real estate bubble may be inimical to the interests of young men, but they benefit retired landowners. Unlike diaspora groups, boomers aren't grasping for great leverage within the political system, or trying to force themselves into elite positions. Once their usefulness has expired, they can be unceremoniously MAiD'd.

The LPC's recent courting of the boomers as their foremost client group - engineered via the installation of Carney and "Elbows Up" - coupled with the fact that the party's top brass remains decidedly Laurentian points towards an embrace of what the X account @kunley_drukpa has deemed "Star Trek Liberalism" - here's a brief explanation of the phenomenon:

> 'Star Trek Liberalism' then is the best, most utopian version of the present-day so-called 'Liberal' settlement, its end telos, 'the kind of future its advocates actually want to bring about'. You could describe it as something like 'Highbrow Multicultural Utopianism'. Some of its advocates might describe it as 'Humanism'. This is in essence high-functioning utopian 'Liberalism but only for 130IQ+ Anglos' with the assumption that everybody on Earth (and in space) is also a '130IQ+ Anglo' or that they can at least be uplifted to the state of middle-class anglodom with the right kinds of education
>
> Gene Roddenberry articulates one of the best versions of this 'humanistic' vision in Star Trek. At least in earlier series you have

> what is essentially a Colonial British Office class emulating the culture & standards of their historical predecessors but in space. They wear uniforms and went to officer school and are all preoccupied with hierarchy and honour and fairness and discovery etc etc. It is 'Master and Commander' except the crew are a rainbow coalition of nationalities and species. They are out together 'exploring the Final Frontier', overcoming problems with intelligence and resourcefulness.

LPC client groups may form a veritable United Nations of ethnicities, religions, and nationalities - but there is something of a gentleman's agreement within the party that a particular sect, a collection of 30-or-so well-heeled Laurentian families, should be the "first among equals" and steer the ship. Carney - the Harvard-Oxford educated governor of two central banks - may be the archetypal Star Trek Liberal. He could also be the last.

On May 9, a seemingly unimportant and mundane event occured - the Ontario Liberal Party (OLP) held a nomination contest for an upcoming by-election in the riding of Scarborough Southwest (a riding that,

according to 2021 census data, is 61.4% non-white). The candidate assumed to be a shoe-in in this race was Nate Erskine-Smith, a 41-year old Oxford-educated lawyer and federal MP for the neighbouring riding of Beaches-East York (which, for the record, is 36.1% non-white). Erskine-Smith, who had been removed from his position as federal housing minister following the 2025 election, was parachuting into Scarborough Southwest as part of a planned entry into the OLP leadership race. In the run-up to the vote, he consistently pandered to the various ethnic blocks - such as the Bengali community - that make up the riding. Yet come voting time, he lost - albeit by a razor-thin 19-vote margin - to local pizza franchisee Ahsanul Hafiz, a man with no political experience who nonetheless was able to adeptly find just enough fellow Bengalis who were willing to cast a ballot for him, presumably on the basis that he was one of them.

Star Trek Liberalism - if it is not careful in erecting firm barriers - will slowly be consumed by the masses of global favella dwellers the LPC has let in to and consistently engaged in brokerage with for decades. That process, as evidenced by the Scarborough Southwest debacle, is already

well underway. When Carney steps aside after the usual decade-or-so tenure of most PM's, this carnivorous strip-mining of the LPC for parts will only accelerate.

In order to maintain their grip on power, the Laurentian Inner Party could become more explicitly aristocratic, creating blockades that go beyond a mere gentleman's agreement - directly appointing candidates and ending open nomination races, further increasing bilingualism requirements, or even disqualifying certain candidacies outright. We already saw some of this in the last leadership race, where Chandra Arya and Ruby Dhalla - candidates who could have pulled off unexpectedly strong showings by virtue of vacuuming up the votes of ethnic blocks - were disqualified to clear the way for Carney. Arya even has his nomination revoked so Carney could run in his Nepean riding.

Eventually, though, if the Inner Party's survival instincts wane even slightly - which isn't implausible considering their thoroughly nihilistic aims and lack of a higher telos - these barriers could be breached and the global majority could find their way in. Contrary to the blank slatist

assumptions of Star Trek Liberalism, new arrivals would, in all likelihood, not possess the same sense of realpolitik that the current LPC Machiavellians possess. Their friend-enemy distinction would be activated by not just the CPC, but by other ethnic blocks with which they have historical baggage. This would ineluctably result in a plethora of internecine conflicts - Khalistani vs. Hindutva, Muslim Socon vs. LGBT, Palestinian vs. Israeli - which would erode the LPC's sense of their right to govern, plunging them into a Hobbesian war of all against all. Such passion for these conflicts is already present among LPC MPs - if these passions spread to the upper echelons of the party, it could be potentially fatal. Death by the favella, if you will.

So far, the picture of a potential descent into anarchy I have painted is one where the LPC loses - if not immediately at the ballot box (as client groups will still deliver them votes, at least until those client groups decide to split off and form new political parties on explicitly ethnic lines), then in terms of losing a clear sense of their right-to-govern real meaning. But how, you may ask, could they be defeated by their right-of-centre opponents? How could we not just watch them lose, but

win? After all, if my "where goes the LPC, so goes Canada" maxim from earlier is true, roiling ethnic conflict within the LPC would signal such conflict occurring - probably to a far more severe degree - amongst the general populace. It will be easy to watch with schadenfreude as the LPC disintegrates; it will be another thing to build something capable of replacing it.

The CPC, far from being a hard party, is a loose agglomeration of malcontents, those broadly dissatisfied with LPC rule - libertarians, evangelical dispensationalists, soft Quebecois nationalists, and a rump handful of Albany Club Toronto Tories. None of these group, as much as they may froth-at-the-mouth in rage against the LPC, have a clear sense of destiny, of a right to govern. There is no single vision that unites them other than shared hatred and they don't have a coherent strategy for dismantling the external organs of LPC power - the permanent bureaucracy, academia, the subsidized news media, and a myriad of NGOs.

In order for the Canadian right-of-centre to not just watch the Hobbesian chaos that comes following the Carney Reich, but actually seize power, dismantle the Laurentian leviathan, and end once-and-for-all the entropic Pearson-PET paradigm that we have lived under for 60 years, a hard party is needed. Unlike the nihilistic LPC, this hard party will need to be oriented around a clearly expressed point of principle - in my opinion, immigration restriction, since it is the defining issue of our times, would be well-suited to this role.

A hard party might need to gets its start by infiltrating the CPC - capturing EDA boards, securing candidate nominations for “our guys”, and slowly building up a caucus of MPs who act as sleeper agents. Once enough hard party MPs have been elected so as to have leverage over the CPC, the sleeper agent MPs can “come out” and be open about their beliefs. The CPC, faced with an insurgency inside their walls, will either capitulate to the demands of the insurgents or be expel them - something that would decrease the size of their caucus significantly, and could potentially cement the hard party as the dominant force on the Canadian

right-of-centre the same way the 1993 election supplanted the PCs with Reform. Of course, this alone would be inadequate to affect *regime change* - a complete course of action in that regard remains hazy, and no one really seems to have any clear idea as to what the final steps, the steps that would involve crossing the Rubicon, would be.

Although it is fraught to speculate about such matters, a black swan event could potentially play an instigating role in both the LPC's collapse and a hard party's rise - such events are, of course, by their nature, impossible to predict in terms of both substance and timing. There is no use in delaying taking necessary actions in politics because of a hypothetical future event of this sort, even if one subconsciously desires a black swan event happening.

But, for the meantime, it is sufficient to understand why the Thousand Year Carney Reich exists, how it ends, and what could come along and put an end to our malaise as a nation once Star Trek Liberalism shatters. There are crowns in the gutter everywhere. It is our duty to pick them up.